

We may justly be proud of the legacy left us by these members of our chosen profession. Let us be true to the ideals they have established; *true to the ideal that unselfish personal service pays best*, that it is the real essence of living, and it is *this* that has written the names of our comrades in the hearts of grateful men and women.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT-ELECT *

By GRANVILLE MacGOWAN, M. D., Los Angeles.

The House of Delegates did me the high honor of selecting me as the presiding officer of the association for the year 1924. Lacking moral courage to refuse this gift of preference I did not seek and for which I was not prepared, it is accepted with grateful appreciation of the honor it confers.

It has been esteemed good form for the president, in assuming the duties of his office, to discourse upon ethics as observed among ourselves, as brethren and as affecting our relations to our clients; upon the desirability of an intensive training of the student of medicine so that he may be the better fitted when time and practice has ripened his judgment and trained his reason to give better service to the sick who may employ him, and be better able to defend the privilege and assert the right of the disciplined and scientifically competently drilled medical mind to act as guide and counsel in all legislative or executive proposals which have as their purport improving, safeguarding or regulating better health in the state or nation.

The president is not restricted in his choice of a theme for a dissertation. He may choose to write and present an essay upon the distinguished dead, who have held high the torch that has spread hope's rays into the beclouded foggy, brumous, cheerless chamber of the sick and made the world a better earth to live upon; or he may, out of his own experience, present his knowledge upon any subject, medical or surgical, the relation and presentation of which he believes will be of instructive interest to his audience.

With this rich cadre to choose from, I have selected a subject which is closer to my heart than any knowledge or surmise that may be gained from the seven major branches of medical science and which in these strenuous days, when the hebetudinous body politic, dulled from the continuous practice of the serious sin of hypocrisy, scarcely noting the prevalent disorder and lawlessness, sits benumbed while the undermining current of the stream of dissatisfaction and distrust of the things that are because they are, skillfully guided, to wash against the jutting foundation of our constitutional prerogatives and protective guaranties by wise, adroit and subtle men, who, having achieved places of authority, wait for the dyke to crumble, believing that out of the eddying currents of the swirling incoming waters of disturbance and destruction will to them accrue the benefit; the right to govern and provide the opportunity for the easy accumulation of great wealth, fame, and power without limit.

Were I a famed dissertator, with my facts and

fancies arranged and indexed in the cubicles of my mind so that my facile tongue could, without error or confusion, produce them in orderly array, I would place dependence upon rhetorical skill to arouse in you reflexion and contemplation of the distance that we have wandered from the portals of our constitutional republic and the desirability of pausing before we become altogether lost, and urge returning before it is too late. I prefer the slower but more certain exposition of the written word.

In this century, almost from its beginning, have we, the people of these United States, cast off the moorings of our bark, the republic, from the safe anchorage of that constitution provided for us by that little band of thirty-seven patriots, and of whom seven—George Clymer, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, Gouverneur Morris, George Reed, and Roger Sherman—twelve years before had signed the Declaration of Independence, mutually pledging "their lives, their futures and their sacred honor" to its upholding. In that interval, the Revolutionary War was fought, and finally won; a delayed agreement among the colonies was finally signed in 1781, as an article of confederation of perpetual union. But there was no union, not even for a day; bickerings, dissensions, exhibitions of faithlessness between the states were continuous. The end of the experiment in freedom seemed to draw near.

Impotence of a Congress, whose powers were flaunted at home and derided abroad, appeared to finally point to this end of the experiment of the rearing of the child of freedom upon the North American continent. The dissolution of the Union into thirteen governments, with divergent interests, different views, ceaseless jealousies, appeared unavoidable. Paralysis of industry, and exploitation by the powerful European kingdoms seemed straight ahead.

In May, 1781, the convention of delegates, charged with the duty of "rendering the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of the Union," met in Philadelphia. These men, chosen from the states because of their erudition, good judgment, practical business ability, and political wisdom, were presided over by George Washington, then and until he died, the most prominent trusted man in America.

In an age and time when the only methods of communication were the stage coach, the sailing vessel, and the dispatch bearer, and when there was no telephone or telegraph; when the assistance of stenographers, typewriters, and statistical experts could not be availed of; when methods of illumination that make of the night a better time than the day for intellectual work were lacking, the members of the convention themselves, without external aid, did all of the rough drafting, correction after debate, and final shaping of the notes upon each and every measure, including the ultimate engrossment, before signing, working less than 100 days from May 14 to September 17. After much discussion and rancorous debate, by the end of 1788 this constitution had been ratified by all of the states of the Union, except North Carolina and Rhode Island, and the government was in motion before these two states agreed to go along.

* Presented at the Fifty-third Annual Session of the California Medical Association, Los Angeles, May 15, 1924.

Is it, as its socialistic and communistic detractors would have us believe, a damning evidence of its unfairness and incapacity, and its culpable capitalistic tyranny that, under its beneficent protection, in only twelve decades the Union expanded from the boundaries of its narrow strip, extending just a few hundred miles back from the shores of the Atlantic Ocean to cover the entire rich loin of the North American continent from the Bay of Fundy to Cape Mendocino and from the Rio Grande to the Lake of the Woods. Peopled by whom? By the direct and ultimate descendants of the 2,500,000 of the financially embarrassed and physically exhausted colonists who had won a bitterly contested prolonged war for freedom. These capitalistic autocrats, who spun their own clothes, ploughed their own fields, and drew their own nets. While they remained and had their natural increases which gave for many years the leaven to the mass of immigrants with whom they shared their inheritance, a horde of economically discontented artisans and peasants, of ambitious youths longing for a chance to rise above the positions in which they were born and forced to remain by the fetters of class, the politically oppressed, the restless of every branch of the Aryan races of the north of Europe, driven from their homes by adverse fortune, by war, by famine, but chiefly by the hunger for land, which might not be had at home, they came in millions up to the last decades of the nineteenth century, and as they came, spread out in all directions across the mountain ranges and the endless prairies, over the great divide to the Pacific slope. They paused as they went, breaking farms and building cities, establishing states, each with a republican form of government, and everywhere using the same tongue for communication. These children of the constitution, speaking English, the language of the charter-makers, the language of the people who fought for the privilege of the opportunity to found a government which for the first time in the history of the world gave security of individual rights, civil liberty, freedom of the press, religious freedom, popular education, extended suffrage, and freedom of speech. But not the right by speech to incite rebellion and destruction of the government itself, for their Declaration of Independence recites, "Prudence indeed will dictate that government long established should not be changed for light and transient causes."

Under no other form of government except that of a republic could this have been accomplished; but it was a task relatively easy by reason of the similarity of purpose and ultimate aim—the building of states like unto the thirteen originals, which not only furnished the model for government, but the habits and customs of daily life, and the language which makes for homogeneity.

With the exhaustion of the tillable soil, that might be had almost for the asking, we changed to a manufacturing country from an agricultural one, and from then on came, one by one, the changes in our government, insidiously at first, and then the flood. It was the colonist and the emigrant of the first century of our existence who pioneered; it was he who developed the country. It is he and his de-

scendants who are its chief owners now. It is they who chiefly constituted the bourgeois against whom the flood of hate is let loose by envious communistic radicals of a late immigration who have brought their bitter, age-old, fierce struggle against all government. From the countries of Central and South-eastern Europe immigrants came, speaking many tongues, without any knowledge of the foundation of our government or of the opportunities it affords to the poor to cast aside their rags and crusts by industry. Ignorant of our customs, traditions and language, but avid of gain, willing to work for a pittance and able to live upon it, and accumulate for them comparative riches to send back to, or carry home with them to their natal villages, there to live in affluence was their object. Strangers in the land, concerned not at all about its government, living segregated in groups, speaking no language but their own, controlled by patrons, contractors, or bankers of their own race, their scent smelled good to the professional politician, who passed many of them by connivance through the melting-pot and made them citizens, their votes often controlling the destiny of states.

These people, in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, commenced to be diverted to the rapidly expanding industrial life of the mines and the great factories in the great cities, where but too often they had for masters iron-hearted men who, having been laboring men themselves, had lost the mental contact with their class. Men who, in the words of Benassis, "passing from the simple life of a laborer to an easy life of ownership grow unbearable, form a class, half-virtuous, half-educated, half-ignorant, which will always be the despair of governments," drunk with the power of new riches, mercilessly refused to treat with their employees who, incensed at the unfair division of the profits and led by a new class of intelligent and well-paid buccaneers, the labor union walking delegates staged strike after strike, which was met by these stubborn, shortsighted and rich peasant-minded employers by further importations of a flood of cheap—for a time at least—ignorant, debased labor to break the strikes.

Amidst this industrial strife in 1891, the Populist party was born at Cincinnati. This was designed to alleviate all of the wrongs, real or fancied, of the citizens of these United States, whom the goddess of fortune had treated invidiously, but more particularly unfortunate agriculturists and working men. It declared primarily for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, the issue of fiat money, the very issue which kept Rhode Island out of the original convention for the preparation of the constitution, public ownership, the prohibition of alien ownership of lands and the popular election of United States Senators. Late in 1900 the party demanded the election of the President, Vice-President, and Federal Judges, by the direct vote of the people. This party never had enough adherents to place anyone of note or ability in an elective office, but its tenets afforded the opportunity to that wonderful orator, its leader, the grand commander of the order of demagogues and perennial candidate for the presidency to infect the American public with its virus and to make himself the arbiter of

the Democratic party for a score of years. So deep was its benumbing influence that, in 1912, in the platform of the Progressive party, we find it demanding the direct election of United States Senators and the adoption of the initiative referendum and recall, and we even find the illustrious candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, advocating, in Arizona, then as now a radical state, the recall of judges.

I dwell upon these matters because the adoption by the American politicians of all parties of these socialistic measures has insensibly almost completely changed our form of government. Nearly every measure proposed by the Populist party has been erected into a statutory law through one or other of our political parties from reasons of pure expediency. The few who have known what our constitution stands for have feared to oppose the oncoming wave of democracy, or their selfish interests have been served by silence.

This constitution which provided for the election of:

First—An executive.

Second—A legislative body who, working together in a representative capacity, have all power of appointment, all powers of legislation, to raise revenues and to spend them appropriately, and to create,

Third—A judiciary to pass upon the justice and legality of their governmental acts, and to recognize certain inherent individual rights was and should be again the supreme law of the land.

It is simple; its observance makes a republic. Any adding or taking away from the powers of any one of the tripartite changes the government to an autocracy or a democracy, the unfailing breeders of injustice, tyrannical destruction of individual rights and spoliation. Of the two, an unbridled democracy is the worst, for at all times men in crowds will do shameful acts that, as individuals, they would not dare, or doing, deplore. "The constitution provides a way for protecting individual liberty from the invasion of the powers of the government itself, as well as from the invasion by others, more powerful and less scrupulous than ourselves." Under the constitution the people are permitted to do but two things—once in four years to vote for a President and Vice-President, which has always produced a disturbance, social and commercial, and once in two years to vote for a member of Congress in their districts; and that is enough.

If, that is done and done intelligently, the voter will have made the best provision possible for the safeguarding of his rights, and if it is done by all who have the right to vote, how can the elected representative gainsay the conscience and intelligence of his constituency?

From direct legislation is substituted, for the conclusions of deliberate judgment and debate, the organized propaganda of prejudice, or the unreasonable demands of the selfish but determined minority, swayed by the oratory of men who by noisy and impudent clamor seek to conceal their interest and full intent by posing as patriots guarding the public funds in the interest of the lowly and oppressed while fishing in the troubled waters for the power

and its profits from which an orderly government excludes them.

In seeking a remedy for the evils arising in the selection of candidates for our elective offices, under a representative form of government as expressed in bossism and combinations of great industrial interests for the purpose of controlling legislation and directing it into improper channels, Theodore Roosevelt as leader, supported by men of honest purpose and sincerity, and filled with patriotism as they saw it, sought by girdling the tree to remove all nourishment from the branches which showed evidences of decay, and they opened the way for a slow and persistent attack upon our constitutional growth by the pestilent, destructive, radical insects of socialism, communism and sovietism, which threaten to destroy it. In steering away from Scylla, we scraped the ledge of Charybdis.

In place of the one recognized political boss, who was not always as nefarious as he has been painted, the cabal was substituted. In the place of the caucus, before which no unknown man could appear with any hope of success of obtaining a nomination for office, was substituted the direct primary into which candidates entered without the accredited and public sponsorship of party organization, which in case of misdeed, at least, possessed the power of the disciplinary punishment of ostracism. For the legislative enactment of statutory decrees was substituted the initiative and the referendum, which gave for the first time in history, in a great government, the opportunity for the unsettled, unprepared, and undisciplined voting populace to originate extra statutory measures of law and to enact them, usually to the detriment of the body politic, to the disturbance of order and to the enormous increase of debt burden to the state. At the same time these socialistic demands by bodies intent upon public recognition of their theories of reform have resulted under pressure, including the passage of Article XVIII of the amendments, of the enactment of so many laws in the city, county, state, and nation, that it is no longer possible for anyone to live consciously or unconsciously from sunrise to sunrise without being a breaker of law.

But this was not the only disruptive force at work in high places. In 1912 an educator was elected by the people to be the twenty-eighth President of the United States. This man was an historian and a lawyer, who must have been absolutely familiar with that constitution which he solemnly swore to preserve, protect and defend. Inaugurated in 1913, apparently sane; by education and surroundings presumably conservative, but he had the fatal gift of rhetoric and had acquired a command of our language not equalled by any other American of his time; a phrase-maker; as an educator, an autocrat; as President, a man who, while professing the greatest interest in the people, held himself aloof from them and closed the White House gates. A man who was self-sufficient, and often obstinately refused both before and during the war to give audience or counsel, or advise the highest officers in departmental or diplomatic life, whose duty it was to carry out his behests, and many of whom did not even know him in person. At the same time, the

doors of the President's house were open for the comings and goings of many strange and curious people—propagandists, whose political doctrines were widely at variance with those of a republic and who at times became his personal representatives abroad. A man who was in many ways a wonderful statesman, and yet the first President of the United States to abrogate the sovereign power entrusted to him by the people in the face of duress by menace, in time of public stress by leaders of a portion of the labor world, demanding class legislation. This man, "too proud to fight" when we were in the midst of war, wanted "peace without victory," to make the world "safe for democracy" when he had known, before his exaltation, that there is no safety in a world in which government is unrestrictedly democratic.

Now why does he bring all this to us, I read in some of your faces. This is politics; what have we to do with politics? We are doctors of medicine. We should worry about direct legislation and its results. Sufficient for each day is its own trouble.

I bring this to you, because it is the privilege of my age and position to advise you; because my daily life spent in many countries and in all social planes has taught me, by friendly concourse, the habits and the psychology of the farmer and stockraiser, the mine and the mill, the newspaper office, the police and the criminal they track, the leaders of labor and the transportation manager, the teacher and the mechanic, the banker and the day laborer, the bureaucrat and the legislator, the Church and the brothel, the Samaritan and the reformer, in hovel and in palace. It has taught me to be broad, to value men for what they are and not for what they seem to be. It has dissipated any prejudice I may have ever had and left me with the ability to see clearly, and I thank God that at least I was born in a republic, whatever may be the form of government I am destined to die under.

Government is the contract by which all agree to live together with as little friction and as much freedom as possible. There is no reason why one group should rule more than another. All are citizens, with the certain constitutional rights of all bound as fates to give the added strength to union. One need not have any illusions about the character of the poor, or of the attitude of the rich. The composing of the differences existing in the ever-present struggle between the multifarious interests of the many callings is an occupation which is entitled to consideration, respect, and reverence. This is politics. It influences every act of our lives, grants or denies every wish, controls our birth and our burial, our movements from place to place by land, by water or air, the character of our residence, our food, the price of our labor, what we drink and when, how we drink it, our luxuries, our comforts, our possessions and what part of them we may keep for our own use. In fact, there is nothing in life, wherever and whoever we may be, that is not controlled by politics—the science of government, which, instead of being an object of derision and distrust to a free people, should be sacred.

I bring it to you because I am interested in you more than in those who follow any other calling,

and because I want to awaken in you a sense of duty as citizens and arouse you to the fact that there is a definite, persistent and well-considered and thought-out plan to entirely change the republic of Benjamin Franklin, John Hancock, and George Washington to a socialistic democracy or worse, and that to stand idly by and not oppose it is a crime against ourselves and the calling which we represent.

To realize and understand the true gravity of the situation, we must visualize the unrest and bitterness of labor of all kinds that has obtained during this century; that powerful and often rival industrial organizations have arisen and been in almost constant warfare with the federal government and that of the states, and frequently with each other.

The labor unions of transport with those of the American Federation, always militant, have at times been obnoxiously so. A dictatorial spirit has evolved from these disturbances that a public opinion, adverse to them, has alone at times been able to curb. But in the main, they have been managed by intelligent men to whom the integrity of the constitution, as protector and guarantor of individual rights, means as much as it does to any other set of patriotic citizens. If at times they appear to be selfish, they are not supremely so. They are socialists only in the acquisition of power to control their wage, with no desire to divide it with anyone or submit to extortion on the part of their leaders. But while their aim to control the government has been continuously developed, it is their right to do so if it can be accomplished by legal means and lawful methods.

There are other groups, however, that have a hatred for all control by government and restraint even by their elected leaders, whose mission is to promote and originate factional industrial strife, creating and fomenting discord in the labor world, bringing it into disrepute so that the unions may be destroyed with the government when their masters determine the opportune moment.

During the fierce economic war of the Western Federation of Miners, in its struggle to control the mines of Western America in Colorado in 1903, one of these outlaw unions was created. A labor organization of revolutionary character, the Industrial Workers of the World, was born. I have already stated that my experience with human groups has been so varied that I usually have no difficulty in understanding their group psychology. It is generally easy for me to put myself in the other man's place. But I never have been able to disentangle the delicate political complex of an I. W. W. They are doctrinaires, inhuman and incendiary, who boldly proclaim their dogma—"that the working class and the employing class have nothing in common. Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world are organized, as they believe, to do away with capitalization. They claim that there can be no arbitration or conciliation, and no contract is binding on employees. Life is a continual war against the capital class." They recognize any kind of direct action, by strife, fire, poison or bullet, either in mass or individual, against organ-

ized society as permissible and commendable if it is to assist in the winning of their objective.

To produce such a state of mind in a mass of men, who set themselves aside as a class and who go to jail by hundreds and inaugurate the hunger strike in order to impede and clog the courts so as to make more disorder to help the cause, indicates a sullen hatred engendered by a conscious or unconscious injury by someone representing the law, as described by Balzac in "The Country Doctor," published in 1832. "The men to whom power is momentarily conferred never think seriously of the effect in the long run of an injustice done to a man of the people. Such injustices keep up in the minds of the people a covert hatred against social superiority. The bourgeois becomes and remains an enemy to the poor man, who forthwith puts him outside the pale of law and deceives and robs him. To the poor, robbery is no longer a crime, but a vengeance. If when a question of justice to the poor man arises an administrator maltreats him and cheats him of his acquired right, how can we expect the unhappy, perhaps starving, creature to feel resignation at his wrongs or respect for property?"

The I. W. W. are never at peace. Always at war with their hands against all who are not affiliated with them. During the World War, they posed as pacifists and went to jail, sooner than fight for the country. With their purposes avowed, they still attract that foolish sympathy so usual in this country for the underdog, without inquiry as to why he is under. Because of their incessant clamor about injustice and martyrdom, active organizations of rich socialists like the Civil Liberties League defend them in the courts and assist them in every conceivable way in their struggle with the government.

But we have a greater and mightier force, for which the I. W. W. is as the prophet John, who went to prepare the way for him who was to follow. An organization not ephemeral, but rich and powerful, whose tenets and rules of conduct are widely different from the ethics which control daily life among governments. It was organized by Carl Marx in London, in 1864, and grew out of the association of English and continental workmen in the World Exposition two years before. It is the International Workmen's Association, known today as the Third Internationale. It had many vicissitudes, but ultimately became the breeding ground for anarchists of the Bakunin type, "propagandists by action," like Johann Most—the type that has destroyed so many European rulers and assassinated two of our Presidents and attempted the life of a third. But, after all, the revolutionary anarchist is dangerous only to those who are rulers. The Internationale has another lot of lawless children who are dangerous to the governments themselves—the syndicalists. Syndicalism is a political and industrial doctrine which demands "that the means of production be distributed to and the government turned over to those workers who are actually useful." Unrestricted force is its basis. It differs from the I. W. W., in that the latter looks forward to the eventual control being in the hands of one big union, while syndicalism uses the same weapon of pacifism to get rid of the army, inaugurating in a general strike a

reign of terror, with violence and cunning obtaining political control by abolishing capital, destroying any police force that may attempt to restrain them, reaping the field that socialism has sown, which compels capitulation or, as in Italy, a dictatorship to escape it.

Long before the European war, the Internationale was strong in Russia. These followers of Marx divided themselves into the moderates, who were just ordinary advanced types of socialists; the Mensheviks, and the ultimates, or extremists; the syndicalists, the bolsheviks. When German intrigue had broken down the Imperial Government of Russia, the mensheviks, the social democrats were, for a short time, in power, but under the rhetorician, Kerensky, who could talk but not act, it did not take very long until the intrepid, cunning, wise, powerful and unscrupulous doctrinaires, the syndicalists of the Internationale, though in a minority, had seized the government and established the soviet—a word which, signifying council and concord, has become synonymous with absolutism and discord, chaos, and disaster. Their leader, Lenine, "offered to the oppressed toiling masses the opportunity to participate actively in the free construction of a new society, a higher form of democracy, the organized form of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

These men who had had their program long prepared were men of action and not of words. Many of them were not even Russians, but all were men admirably fitted for the task they had undertaken. They immediately proscribed the following classes, in that all those who employed others for profit, those living on incomes not derived from their own work, from interest or capital, industrial enterprises, or landed property, private business men of all kinds, including all of the learned professions, middlemen, priests of all denominations, those who had been connected with the police, lunatics and criminals, were not allowed to vote or have voice in governmental affairs. Then this band of criminals, commanded by, as events subsequently proved, a parietic, proceeded to put into effect a scheme of government which, for oppression and murderous malignancy, destroying untold millions of human lives and reducing to poverty and misery all of the creative and administrative intelligence of the land, has never been equaled in any other revolution since the world began. At first, and for a long time, their government was an interesting experiment for the philosophic looker-on and even now, if its results were confined to the country in which it was tried, the interest of other peoples might be only an academical one, for it is axiomatic that the people of a country ultimately obtain the government to which the degree of their intelligence and their virility entitles them. But guided by their idol with the luetic brain, a human Robot, without conscience, faithless, denying the sacredness of any pledge, and of all financial responsibility, they complacently left their subjects to starve while spending the money which they had acquired from the government preceding them, and all that they could extort and rob wherever it could be obtained from private purses, banks, industrial establishments and churches in all Russia so that they might, by bribery and corruption, through the agents of the Third Communist Inter-

ationale, undermine and overrun all the other governments of the world, spending only at home what was necessary to acquire and maintain a great Red army to suppress all freedom of speech and action at home and prevent any counter-revolution, and to be used, if necessary, like that of Mahomet to force the doctrines upon an unwilling world by conquest.

The Soviet Government at Moscow is now the absolute rulers of all Russia, and is synonymous with and controls the Third Communist Internationale. It is and has been for over four years the bitter and persistent enemy of this republic, seeking to destroy it by the silent process of attrition. Many of its leaders have lived in our country and speak our language, and know that two governments supposedly democratic in principle, but as widely different as the sun and darkness, cannot exist together on this earth, and that for the survival of their own chosen form ours must be destroyed. Controlling an imperial purse and indifferent to the economic condition of their subjects, they have much conscious aid among our own people who take, as Judas did, the pieces of silver. The proofs of this are and have been in the possession of our government at Washington, gathered at home and abroad by the agents of the State Department and the Department of Justice under both the Wilson and the Harding administrations, according to the public admissions of the Attorneys-General and the statement of Mr. Hughes, our Secretary of State, and recognition of their government has been steadfastly declined on the ground that it would be opening the door of our house to an enemy. Take heed from the Scriptures: "But know this that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up."—Matthews xxiv, 43. But know this: A million thieves are boring from within; the shutters are loose and the threshold is worn.

The most of us have contributed to the delinquency of our government, state and national, by fervor or by lack of understanding. Intelligentsia have no place under a Soviet, except in jail or the grave. Before we face a civil war, let us go back to the republic which has its best protection against aggression from without and dissension from within, in its possession of an unceasing flow of unending millions of young voters with sound bodies and sane minds to obey its fiats and uphold its laws, and this may only be obtained by a common compulsory military training, which adds to the principle of universal suffrage the appreciation of its honor, and breeds a willingness to make any sacrifice to uphold the government, which assures its permanency.

I bow the knee to General George Washington, who, rising from the President's chair in the constitutional convention 137 years ago, when palliatives and half-measures were suggested in the debate, in the fear that the people might not approve it, and speaking with suppressed emotion, said:

"It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work. Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

RELATION OF SURGERY AND RADIO-THERAPY IN THE TREATMENT OF MALIGNANT DISEASES *

By REX DUNCAN, M. D., Los Angeles

The undiminished, if not increased, mortality rate from malignant diseases would seem to indicate that little has been accomplished in the prevention or treatment of cancer. As a matter of fact, however, considerable progress has been made. Our failure to reduce the mortality rate is due not so much to our lack of knowledge as to our failure to apply to the individual case that treatment, or combination of treatment, which experience has shown offers the greatest prospect of benefit or cure. Propaganda for the purpose of educating the public and the profession has undoubtedly led to the earlier recognition of malignant diseases and the treatment of early malignant conditions. While this is extremely important, we must demonstrate to the public and profession statistically our ability to cope with malignant diseases.

The treatment of malignant diseases necessarily depends upon the characteristics of the individual case. First, it is necessary to determine definitely the location and character of the disease and possible extension or metastasis, as well as to ascertain definitely the patient's general physical condition. Secondly, one must possess a thorough knowledge of the clinical course of the type of malignancy existing. Third, it is extremely important to know the histopathological characteristics of the particular neoplasm. Fourth, one must possess sufficient training and experience with the various methods of therapy to determine that type of treatment or combination of methods which offers the greatest possibility of cure.

Recent developments in the histopathological studies of neoplasms have added a new and oftentimes determining factor in our consideration of the treatment of malignant diseases. It is no longer sufficient for the pathologist to tell us that the neoplasm is simply benign or malignant, but he must tell us more definitely of the degree of malignancy. The most important factor with which we have to deal in carcinoma seems to be the degree of cellular activity. The more a carcinoma tends to differentiate, that is, resemble normal tissue, the lower is its degree of malignancy. Conversely, the more embryonal or more undifferentiated the cells the higher the degree of malignancy. Upon these facts Broders, in 1919, classified epithelioma of the lip into four grades. His plan of grading dependent upon the degree of cellular activity is briefly as follows: Grade 1 is an epithelioma, which shows about three-fourths of its structure differentiated and about one-fourth undifferentiated, with no mitotic figures and no "one-eyed" cells. Grade 2. If the percentage of differentiated or undifferentiated epithelium are about equal, with an occasional mitotic figure and "one-eyed" cells. Grade 3. If the undifferentiated epithelium forms about three-fourths and the differentiated about one-fourth of the growth, with

*Presented to the General Surgery Section at the Fifty-second Annual Session of the California Medical Association, San Francisco, June 22, 1923.